

*BY*  
computer system capable of running multiple programs at once; the recognized word is output to another program for insertion at a cursor position in that other program; and the linguistic context information is obtained from data structures created by the other program.--

REMARKS

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive. In response the title has been amended above in a manner which hopefully will remove this objection.

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action appears to ask for a new abstract of the disclosure. In response a new abstract of the disclosure has been added by the amendment above, which is specifically tailored to the subject matter of this divisional application.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action objected to the disclosure on two grounds. The first is that its lettering (which formerly was in 10 point font) was too small. In response a new copy of the application has been submitted. This new version is identical with the application originally filed in the parent application of this case, except that it is in 12 point type, its pagination is different, and some line returns have been deleted from its title page to help the title page text fit on one 8.5 x 11 inch sheet of paper after expansion to the 12 point font. Since this new version is identical in wording to the application it replaces, it contains no new matter.

Paragraph 3 also objected to the failure of the specification to point out, in its section on related applications, that the parent case of the present case has been allowed. In response an amendment has been made above to the related application section which points out that the parent case has been abandoned in favor of an FWC application.

Paragraph 4 rejects all the claims of this application which were pending before this amendment under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for being vague.

Paragraph 4 alleges that the phrase "...most probably corresponds..." fails to distinctly point out and claim the inventions.

In response, wording has been inserted near this language which should remove any vagueness which might have been a problem.

Paragraph 4 also objects to the phrase on line 7 of Claim 51 which reads "...finding one or more items in said body of text adjacent to..." In response, this phrase has been rewritten in a manner which it is hoped will remove any problems.

Paragraph 4 further objected to the phrase "...will be selected as most probably corresponding to..." at line 9 of Claim 51. In response that claim has been rewritten in a manner that hopefully removes all objections.

Paragraph 4, stated there were similar problems in Claim 53. This was presumably a reference to the phrase "...finding adjacent items in said body of text..." This language has also been rewritten in a manner that hopefully removes any problems.

Paragraph 5 states the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent. From a quick review of these references, none of them appears to provide a basis for denying patentability to the current claims of the present application. The Examiner's summary of these references contained in Paragraph 5 would appear to indicate the same thing.

Please note that the filing receipt in this application listed all of the inventors of the parent application as inventors in this application. This is incorrect. The Request For Filing A Patent Application Under 37 CFR 1.60 used to file this application (a copy of which is enclosed) stated under item 6 that the following were to be the inventors of this application:

-Joel M. Gould, and  
-Frank J. McGrath

and under item 7 that the following inventors named in the parent application were not to be inventors in this case;

-James K. Baker.  
-Elizabeth E. Steele,  
-Peter Heitman,


-Joel W. Parke,  
-Steven D. Squires,  
-Dean G. Sturtvant, and  
-Jed M. Roberts.

The undersigned would like to request that the Examiner please  
enter this correct listing of inventors in the record of this  
application, if it has not already been. If, for any reason, the  
request form used to file this divisional application is insufficient to  
cause the inventorship of this application to be as listed above, it  
would be appreciated if the Examiner could please call or write the  
undersigned attorney so he can take steps to have the inventorship of  
this application corrected.

Enclosed is an information disclosure statement listing the patent  
issued on this application's grandparent application, references cited  
in this application's grandparent and parent applications, references  
cited in the FWC of this application's parent application, and  
additional references of which the applicants are aware for which  
disclosure might be appropriate. Also enclosed is a check for \$240.00  
to cover the fee under fee under 37 CFR §1.17(p) for submitting an  
Information Disclosure Statement under 37 CFR §1.97(c).

In summary, it is hoped that with the changes suggested by the  
Examiner all of the currently pending claims of this application, as  
amended herein -- that is amended Claims 51-53 and new Claims 80-85 --  
appear to be patentable, and prompt allowance of them is respectfully  
requested.

Respectfully Submitted,



Edward W. Porter  
Registration No. 28,892  
Porter & Associates  
One Kendall Square  
Suite 2200  
Cambridge, Mass. 02139  
(617) 494-1722